

Baccalaureate Core Committee

February 10, 2020

Minutes

Voting members present: Heather Arbuckle, Kathy Becker-Blease, Daniel Faltsek, McKenzie Huber, Matthew Kennedy, Filix Maisch, Lori McGraw, Steven Morris, Bob Paasch, Rene Reitsma, David Roundy, Rorie Spill Solberg, Kaplan Yalcin

Voting members absent: Aidas Banaitis, Andrew Harker

Ex-Officio members present: Faculty Affairs – Heath Henry; DPD Director – Nana Osei-Kofi; Ecampus – Karen Watte

Guests present: Tam Belknap

February 13, 2020 Faculty Senate Meeting – Presentation/Votes on No Double-Listing

- The co-chairs and sub-committee head crafted a PowerPoint presentation of the proposed double-listing policy. They presented it to the Executive Committee meeting for review. The Executive Committee made some suggestions for revisions.
 - The current slideshow has the requested revisions: more detail about the policy, why the committee wants to instate, and a definition and examples of double-listing and why it is an issue.
 - ‘Motion’ slide
 - Header changed to ‘Proposed Motion’
 - The wording on the second bullet needs some revision; it is a little confusing. It should clarify that the units will be asked to make a decision and it is up to their discretion. Units who do not decide, the Baccalaureate Core Committee (BCC) will make the decision based on the information in the proposal during assessment.
 - ‘Units will choose in which category dual-listed courses will retain.’
 - ‘...review process during the category review assessment cycle IF a unit has not identified the retained category.’
 - This is a benefit to students. There is less confusion on the part of advisors and students know for sure which category their course is going into. MyDegrees process sometimes move courses, which can cause distress and confusion for students.

Discussion

- [Baccalaureate Core “Laboratory” Definition](#)
 - The definition was crafted by the sub-committee put together last week.
 - They wanted a broad and inclusive enough statement to include every course that may have a lab portion.
 - One committee member was concerned that the last line may be too open to interpretation and that the course that prompted this discussion could argue they have met the categories, despite the concerns of the committee that it does not.
 - 1 credit lab constitutes 3 hours per week, or 30 hours over 10 weeks. The lab assignments proposed by the course did not feel like 3 hour activity.
 - Would a reviewer, not in a science unit, be able to look at the verbiage and use it to determine, accurately, which assignments and activities qualify as lab work?
 - Will this verbiage work for Ecampus courses that have a lab component?
 - Some course types do not allow for the collection of data, like astronomy, where you often have to use collected data from other sources.
 - Students should be drawing conclusions based on empirical data.
 - Could the assignments start with students speculating or hypothesizing where the currents would go?
 - Could students look up the current data themselves, instead of using the journal assignments which provides all the data?
 - Is there a principle of uncertainty in students approaching the lab or lab assignment?
 - Can the committee explore how other institutions define a lab?

- The sub-committee will do some research on how other institutions define their lab components.

Category Proposals

- Discussion needed
 - NMC 493 – Difference, Power and Discrimination
 - Claims to be both on-campus and online but only provides the on-campus syllabus
 - Course traditionally taught online. Additional modality likely added in error. This was confirmed during the meeting.
 - There’s a lot of redundancy, but that is not necessarily an issue. The committee does recommend some of that be pared down for readability and clarity.
 - Send back to fix modality error.
- No Discussion Needed
 - PSY 201 – Social Processes and Institutions
 - Approved with no discussion needed.
 - PSY 202 – Social Processes and Institutions
 - Approved with no discussion needed.

Category Reviews – Contemporary Global Issues

- Discussion needed
 - FW 324
 - Listed as ecampus and Corvallis
 - Not taught on ecampus recently and they did not provide Ecampus syllabus.
 - For category reviews, units are only required to submit syllabi for the modalities taught in the last year. As they did not teach an Ecampus portion, a syllabus is not required.
 - Needs more information on how assignments are assessed for outcomes one and two.
 - The topics for outcomes one and two are all listed, but it does not state how these topics are covered. It is unclear if they are related to readings or discussions. No textbook for the class is listed.
 - Decertify - Send back to ask for more details about outcomes one and two and the assignments tied to these outcomes. Fix other small errors. If they resubmit in four weeks, with revisions, the course can be approved.
 - ANTH 478
 - It is missing the Reach Out statement missing.
 - The student conduct link needs to be updated.
 - The Baccalaureate Core statement is not verbatim.
 - The matrix is vague and doesn’t clarify how assignments are assessed.
 - Decertify - Send back to ask for more details about assessment and to fix other small errors. If they resubmit in four weeks, with revisions, the course can be approved.
 - BI 306 H
 - The course is a Writing Intensive Curriculum (WIC) but none of the WIC requirements are listed in the syllabus.
 - Does not connect assessment to outcomes and assignments.
 - It is only taught as an honors course
 - Mostly attended by students within the majors served by this course
 - Max enrollment of 14
 - Some concerns on whether or not the course is accessible?
 - Dual-listed with Contemporary Global Issues (CGI) and WIC. This gives the course a total of 12 learning outcomes.
 - Should this be sent through the Writing Advisory Board?
 - Not being reviewed for the WIC category, so not necessary. May send it as an FYI.

- The committee will hold off on decisions related to this review until after the Faculty Senate meeting.